

REMARKS

Status

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 26-28 stand rejected. And Examienr interview was conducted on October 30, 2007 in which agreement was reached.

Examiner Interview

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for her consideration in the interview conducted on October 30, 2007 in which agreement was reached. To summarize, the present claims overcome the prior art since the rearrangement of parts as proposed by the Examiner would destroy the functionality of the prior art.

Rejection under 37 C.F.R §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Murphy (U.S. 819,702) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254). In addition, the Examiner has maintained the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 6, 10, 12, 13, 26, and 28 as being unpatentable over Kokubu, Murphy, and Gustavsson in view of Hawes et al. (U.S. 3,915,328), and claim 27 as being unpatentable over Kokubu in view of Hawes.

The present invention is directed to a chamber lamp socket (3) for a refrigerator. Chamber lamp socket (3) includes socket main body (4), support member (5), and lamp holder (8) for receiving a chamber lamp (2). Support member (5) is formed of a flexible synthetic resin. Tip cylindrical portion (5A) extends upwards from the socket main body 4 and includes, on its inner surface, saw-toothed portion (19) having gentle slopes (17) and steep slopes (18). Due to

this structure, the holding force on chamber lamp (2) increases, and rotation of chamber lamp (2) is prevented when exposed to the vibrations caused by opening and closing of refrigerating chamber door (107) and the operation of the refrigerator.

The rejections in the present final Office Action appear to be identical to those in the previous Office Action of May 7, 2007, except for the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4, starting with the last full sentence on page 3. This section pertains to the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 26-28. In addition to her previous assertions, the Examiner now also admits that Gustavsson does not disclose that the slopes of the saw-toothed shape are horizontal to a vertical axis of the chamber lamp. According to the Examiner, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the slopes horizontal to the vertical axis of the chamber lamp. This, the Examiner contends, constitutes mere rearrangement of the parts of an invention, which involves only routine skill. The Examiner also alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the slopes still create the desired frictional relationship, be they located horizontally, vertically, or slanted from the vertical axis. In addition, Murphy discloses slopes for frictional purposes, horizontal to the vertical axis of a lamp.

However, as discussed in the Examiner interview, the rearrangement of parts is not possible in Gustavsson since it would destroy the functionality of the prior art. In the case of Gustavsson the slopes are horizontal slopes are required to keep moisture out of the socket. Changing the positions of the would no longer enable hem to keep out moisture. Therefore, the rearrangement of parts is not possible in this case.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Murphy (U.S. 819,702) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254) is respectfully requested. In addition, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 6, 10, 12, 13, 26, and 28 as being

unpatentable over Kokubu, Murphy, and Gustavsson in view of Hawes et al. (U.S. 3,915,328), and claim 27 as being unpatentable over Kokubu in view of Hawes is also respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **September 6, 2007**.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/ht

Atty. Docket No. **050786**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE